

RECEIVED

NOV 04 1999

EIS000360

2

1 THE FACILITATOR: We'll now begin the formal
2 comment period. Your comments will be transcribed by our
3 court reporter, Nikki Rossy. It will assist in obtaining
4 an accurate record if only one person speaks at once, and
5 if you have any other conversation, if you can just step to
6 the outside.

7 We only have seven folks signed up to
8 comment. On occasion we institute sort of a time limit,
9 but we have found that folks speak for six to seven minutes
10 or so. So I don't think, given the folks who have signed
11 up and the time we have available, we need to institute any
12 sort of a time limit this afternoon.

13 If you have a written copy of your
14 statement, it would assist the court reporter if you could
15 turn that in afterwards. Also, if you have any types of
16 exhibits that you wish to submit, you can give that to me
17 and we can tag those appropriately and those will be
18 entered into the record.

19 So are there any questions about the format
20 for this? All right. We'll get started, and we'll just
21 call people in the order they signed up.

22 The first presenter is Engelbrecht von
23 Tiesenhausen, who is representing Clark County. So if you
24 will join us, I think we'll ask you to speak from the
25 yellow desk over there.

EIS000360

3

2

1 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: I can't sit down?

2 THE FACILITATOR: No, sorry. That will keep your
3 comments brief.

4 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: They are pretty brief
5 already.

6 THE FACILITATOR: All right.

7 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: I'm going to read most of
8 this.

9 I'm happy to be here. My name is
10 Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen, and I represent the Clark
11 County Department of Comprehensive Planning, Nuclear Waste
12 Division. I'm pleased to be here today to provide input to
13 what we feel is an extremely important document to all
14 individuals potentially affected by this program, the Yucca
15 Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement, DEIS.

16 The DEIS will be used by the Department of
17 Energy and others to make decisions that could impact our
18 communities. It is imperative, therefore, that the public
19 make their views known, either at this hearing or in
20 writing prior to the February 9th, 2000, comment deadline.

21 The DEIS is intended to describe impacts to
22 the environment. Among its purposes and of great
23 importance in considering a high-level nuclear waste
24 disposal site at Yucca Mountain is fulfilling the
25 responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the

1 environment for succeeding generations.

2 The NEPA process, of which this Draft
3 Environmental Impact Statement is a part, is intended to
4 help public officials make decisions that are based on
5 understanding of environmental consequences and take
6 actions that protect, restore, and enhance the
7 environment. The environment referred to in NEPA includes
8 the human environment, and protection of human health and
9 safety is implicit in the goals of this act.

10 The NEPA procedures are designed to ensure
11 that environmental information is available to public
12 officials and citizens before decisions are made and before
13 actions are taken, and the purpose of NEPA regulations is
14 to assure that federal agencies respond according to letter
15 and spirit of the act.

1 16 In participating in the NEPA process for the
17 proposed Yucca Mountain high-level nuclear waste deposit
18 program, it is important to remember it's not just another
19 federal program. The Yucca Mountain program is entirely
20 unprecedented in its scope, its time frame, the
21 geographical area it encompasses, and the nature and extent
22 of the potential impact associated with it. Yet this draft
23 document treats Yucca Mountain as if it were just another
24 dam, pier, or road.

25 Given the transportation scenarios contained

1 in the Draft EIS, rural Nevada communities could be more
2 heavily impacted by shipments of radioactive materials
3 destined for Yucca Mountain than any other community in
4 this country. That is because two of the proposed rail
5 spur routes, at least one of the heavy-haul truck routes,
6 and an alternative route for legal weight truck shipments
7 would pass through or very close to these communities. All
8 or nearly all of the spent fuel and high-level waste slated
9 for disposal could be shipped through northern Nye and
10 Esmeralda County.

2 11 The document, Draft EIS, fails to
12 demonstrate the feasibility of large-scale, long-term
13 heavy-haul truck shipments or spent nuclear fuel and
14 high-level waste in large rail casks, weighing 125 tons or
15 more, over hundreds of miles on public highways on a
16 regular basis. The heavy-haul truck transport system
17 proposed by DOE is completely unprecedented.

3... 18 The Draft EIS also underestimates the
19 consequences of severe accidents and terrorist/sabotage
20 incidents involving heavy-haul truck shipments. The close
21 proximity of the highway to hotels, casinos, retail
22 businesses, schools, churches, and residences would
23 increase human health effects in the event of an accident
24 or incident involving loss of cask containment or
25 shielding. Proximity to the route would increase the

3 cont. 1 economic consequences of a heavy-haul truck accident or
2 incident, even one involving no loss of cask integrity.

4 3 The Draft EIS also ignores the potential
4 for significant adverse socioeconomic impacts along
5 heavy-haul truck routes due to public perception of risk
6 and stigma effects. Such impacts could include reduced
7 property values, reduced income for existing businesses,
8 and loss of new investment.

5 9 The lack of understanding of the hydrologic
10 flow system downgradient from Yucca Mountain is also of
11 concern to Clark County. How can future impacts to
12 groundwater be bounded when the saturated zone hydrology is
13 not well understood?

14 In view of this, Nye, Clark, and Inyo County
15 are cooperating in an aeromagnetic survey of the critical
16 area. This survey, we hope, will give additional and
17 useful data in clarifying some of the currently, only
18 dimly, understood issues regarding the hydrologic regime in
19 the area possibly affected by Yucca Mountain. I'm happy to
20 report that the Clark County Commission approved this
21 tri-county interlocal contract on November 2nd, 1999.

22 Clark County will be submitting extensive
23 written comments on this Draft Environmental Impact
24 Statement for a high-level nuclear waste repository at
6... 25 Yucca Mountain. It is our hope that these comments and

7
4

6 cont. | 1 those of others will be seriously considered and that a
2 reasonable no-action alternative is selected as the
3 preferred action in the Final Environmental Impact
4 Statement.

5 I hope I didn't go too forward in time.

6 THE FACILITATOR: You're fine.

7 Our next presenter is Judith Shankle.